

living replica of the donor of the genetic material. I know of no serious support for such research and the Greenwood amendment would ban that.

In order to tilt the debate about genetic cell replication research, some opponents lump it with Dolly the sheep. No one supports reproductive cloning, and no one benefits from such confusion except those who hope to spur an overreaction. The Greenwood amendment would prohibit reproductive cloning without shutting down valuable research.

Some also argue to prohibit genetic cell replication research because it might—in the wrong hands—be turned into reproductive cloning research. I cannot support this argument.

Such a prohibition is no more reasonable than to prohibit all clinical trials because researchers might give overdoses deliberately. It is as much overreaching as prohibiting all organ transplant studies because an unscrupulous person might buy or sell organs for profit.

All research can be misused. That's why we regulate research, investigate abuse of subjects, and prosecute scientific fraud and misconduct.

If researchers give drug overdoses in clinical trials, the law requires that they be disbarred and punished. If someone were to traffick in organs, the law requires that they be prosecuted. And if someone were to develop reproductive cloning, under the Greenwood amendment, they could be prosecuted for a felony.

And the Greenwood ban will be every bit as effective as the Weldon ban on all research. If someone is deterred by one felony penalty, they will be deterred by the other.

Finally, let me point out that the Greenwood amendment cleans up two major drafting mistakes in the Weldon bill—mistakes that in and of themselves should be enough to make Members oppose the Weldon bill.

First, as the dissenting views in the Committee Report note, this bill criminalizes some forms of infertility treatments. These are not the science fiction clones that people have been talking about today; this is a woman and a man who want to have a child—using her egg and his sperm and some other genetic materials to make up for flaws in one or the other. And this bill would make this couple and their doctor felons. That's wrong. They only want a healthy child of their own—but the Weldon bill would stop that.

Second, the Weldon bill makes criminal all products that are derived from this research. This means that if an advance in research elsewhere leads to a new protein or enzyme or chemical, that protein or enzyme or chemical cannot be brought into the country—even if it requires no creation of new fertilized eggs and is the cure for dreaded diseases. That's wrong. It is an over-reaction that does not serve any useful end.

I urge my colleagues to support the Greenwood amendment. We should clearly define what we believe is wrongdoing, prohibit it, and enforce that prohibition. The Greenwood amendment does that.

But we should not shut down beneficial work—clinical trials, organ transplants, or genetic cell replication—because of a risk of wrongdoing, and we should not ban some things by the accident of bad drafting.

The Congress should not prohibit potentially life-saving research on genetic cell replication

because it accords a cell—a special cell, but only a cell—the same rights and protections as a person. No one supports creating a cloned human being, but we should allow research on how cells work to continue.

Mr. GREENWOOD. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 30 seconds.

The gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. STUPAK) asked for an example of how this research is working. Dr. Okarma, who testified at our hearings, spoke of how they have taken mice who had damaged hearts, they used somatic cell nuclear transfer to take the cells of the mice, turn them into pluripotent stem cells, and then into heart cells, and then they injected those heart cells into the heart of the mouse. What happened? Those cells behaved like heart cells. They pumped blood and kept the mouse alive.

All we are asking for here today is to give the people of the world, the people of this country, the same chance that the mouse had.

Mr. SENSENBRENNER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from California (Mr. CUNNINGHAM).

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, John Porter, the former chairman of Labor-HHS, asked me to do a terrible thing once. He asked me to chair a committee with children with exotic diseases. I had to shut down the committee it hurt so much. One little girl said, Congressman, you are the only person that can save my life, and that little child died, and there are thousands of these children.

I am 100 percent pro-life, 11 years, but I support stem cell research of discarded cells. The concern that all of us have is, if we go along with the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. GREENWOOD), the same thing will happen that happened in England. They started with stem cell research, then they expanded it to nuclear transfer of the somatic cells. Then they went to human cloning, and even a subspecies so that they can use body parts.

Where does it stop? The only way that we can control this research through the Federal Government is to make sure that these ethical and moral values are adhered to. We have to stop it here.

Support the Weldon bill, oppose the Greenwood bill.

Mr. DEUTSCH. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes 15 seconds to the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. PRICE).

(Mr. PRICE of North Carolina asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. PRICE of North Carolina. Mr. Speaker, the Human Cloning Prohibition Act is a bill we should not be debating with such brevity and haste. Cloning is manifestly not the same issue as stem cell research, much less abortion, and 2-minute snippets fail to do justice to the complex issues involved.

I am tempted to vote against both the bill and the substitute on the grounds that neither has been sufficiently refined or adequately debated.

But that could be interpreted as a failure to take seriously the ethical issues that cloning raises and the need to block the path to reproductive cloning. That is the last thing we should want to do, for as Leon Kass and Daniel Callahan have argued in a recent article, reproductive cloning would threaten individuality and confuse identity, confounding our very definition of personhood, and it would represent a giant step toward turning procreation into manufacture.

I will vote for the Greenwood substitute as the best of the available alternatives. We are not certain of the promise of somatic cell nuclear transfer, or therapeutic cloning, research for the treatment or cure of diseases such as Alzheimer's, diabetes, Parkinson's or stroke. But we simply must take the enormous potential for human benefit seriously.

In moving to head off morally unacceptable reproductive cloning, we must take great care not to block research for treatments which have great potential for good and could run afoul of the ban included in H.R. 2505.

Critics such as Kass and Callahan argue persuasively that the ban on reproductive cloning contained in the Greenwood substitute would be difficult to enforce. But would the ban of nuclear transfer contained in H.R. 2505 be more easily enforced? As the dissenting views of the Committee on the Judiciary report argue,

If a ban on the surgical procedure of implanting embryos into the uterus is unenforceable, a ban on a procedure that takes place in a petri dish in the privacy of a scientific laboratory is even more so.

Mr. Speaker, these are very difficult matters. We should not suppose that our votes here today, whatever the result, will resolve them. We must do the best we can, drawing the moral lines that must be drawn, while weighing conscientiously the possible benefits of new lines of research for the entire human family.

I believe the Greenwood substitute is the best among imperfect alternatives, and I urge its adoption.

□ 1645

Mr. SENSENBRENNER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. PITTS).

Mr. PITTS. Mr. Speaker, we need to clarify something here. This issue is not about what the other side called a group of cells or insoulment or a leap of faith; it is about human life at its very beginning.

This amendment is not a cloning ban. It has a 10-year moratorium in it; but, in fact, for the first time this amendment would specifically make cloning legal, and it would require that human clones be killed after they are made, which is even more unethical.

Now, some have suggested that cloned embryos are not really embryos at all. That is ridiculous. We might as well say that Dolly, who began as a cloned sheep embryo, is not really a